

REMARKS

This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 26, 2007, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Preliminary Matter

Applicant notes that Arner et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0002599; hereinafter “Arner”) was cited in the body of the Office Action, but was not listed on the PTO Form 892 enclosed with the Office Action. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Arner reference be listed in a PTO Form 892 in a subsequent Office Action.

II. Rejection of claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arner in view of applicant’s admissions.

Arner is directed to a real-time Global Positioning System (GPS) in two-way mobile wireless networks. As discussed in paras. [0352]-[0353] of Arner, an embodiment includes a tourist end-user traveling to visit a national park. The end-user carries a handheld computer which includes a GPS receiver and permits the user to inquire about camping sites within ten miles of the user’s location. The user’s request is transmitted to the Internet and to an application program running on a server system which locates information on campgrounds from a database. The database includes information including campsite reservations, fee, and facilities.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites:

"A camping facility reservation method, for making a camping facility reservation, comprising:

storing respective camping pad attribute information for camping pads of a camping facility;

storing camping vehicle attribute information for a given camping vehicle;

obtaining reservation request information concerning the camping facility and the given camping vehicle; and

providing an indication of one or more candidate camping pads based on the respective camping pad attribute information of the camping pads of the camping facility and the camping vehicle attributes for the given camping vehicle."

The Examiner asserts that Arner in combination with the Applicant's Admissions in the Applicant's specification teaches the claimed elements. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is no teaching or suggestion that Arner is concerned with making camping facility reservations for a camping vehicle. There is no teaching or suggestion of a camping vehicle in Arner.

In addition, there is no teaching or suggestion in Arner that camping pad attribute information is stored, that vehicle attribute information on a camping vehicle is stored, or that reservation request information concerning a camping facility and the given camping vehicle is obtained. Arner is concerned with a GPS system and is not concerned with making appropriating camping facility reservations for a camping vehicle based on the attributes of the camping vehicle, as disclosed in an exemplary embodiment of the Applicant's invention.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Arner discloses a database containing information on reservations, fees and facilities. However, merely because Arner discloses reservations does not teach or suggest that camping pad attribute information is stored.

The Examiner further asserts that since Arner discloses a database query, that Arner discloses obtaining reservation request information concerning the camping facility and the given camping vehicle. However, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, there is no teaching or suggestion of information regarding a camping vehicle. Further, Arner is not at all concerned with camping pad information, let alone of providing an indication of one or more candidate camping pads based on the respective camping pad attribute information of the camping pads of the camping facility and the camping vehicle attributes for the given camping vehicle, as claimed.

The Examiner concedes that Arner does not disclose camping vehicle attribute information for a camping vehicle, however, the Examiner asserts that camping vehicles are a primary way for campers to utilize camping pads. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of camping pads in Arner. The Examiner's arguments appear to be purely based on the Examiner's personal reasoning without any support in the prior art.

Further, it would not be obvious to modify Arner to include the claimed elements. As discussed above, Arner is directed to a GPS system and not to a camping reservation system, as claimed. The Examiner's motivation for the combination is clearly a result of impermissible hindsight upon viewing the Applicant's disclosure. Further, the Examiner's motivation for the combination appears to be based on an assumption that Arner discloses either a camping vehicle or a camping pad, however, a camping vehicle and a camping pad are not disclosed in Arner. Therefore, the Examiner's motivation for the combination is clearly improper.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. To the extent independent claims 4 and 15 recite similar subject matter, claims 4 and 15 and their dependent claims should be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 2

Claim 2 recites:

"wherein the camping vehicle attribute information comprises one or more of:

tip-out portion particulars;
vehicle dimensions;
location of connections for hook-ups;
turning radius;
wheelbase; and
tolerance for slopes."

The Examiner concedes that Arner does not teach this aspect of the claim, however, the Examiner asserts that the Applicant's specification discloses a tip-out portion is part of a camping vehicle.

However, merely because a tip-out portion is a part of a camping vehicle, does not teach or suggest that camping vehicle attribute information, which is used for making a reservation at a camping facility, includes information regarding a tip-out portion of a vehicle. As discussed in the Applicant's specification, a deficiency in the prior art is that a tip-out portion of a vehicle was not taken into consideration when making a reservation in the prior art. See para. [0014] of the Applicant's specification. Therefore, an exemplary embodiment of the Applicant's disclosure overcomes that deficiency.

For at least the above reasons, claim 2 should be deemed allowable.

Claim 8

Claim 8 recites "wherein the camping vehicle attribute information comprises camping vehicle attachment information relating to one or more of a boat, a trailer, and a motor vehicle." The Examiner takes Official Notice that it would be obvious to one of skill in the art for vehicle attribute information to comprise vehicle attachment information. However, the Examiner has

not even shown where camping vehicle is disclosed in the prior art. Therefore, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious that vehicle attribute information, which is used to obtain a reservation at a camping facility, would also include vehicle attachment information, as claimed.

Further, when an Applicant traverses an Examiner's assertion of Official Notice, the Examiner should cite evidentiary support. MPEP 2144.03C.

For at least the above reasons, claim 8 should be deemed allowable.

III. Rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arner in view of applicant's admissions and in further view of DeLorme et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040; hereinafter "DeLorme"). Claim 6 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 4 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, DeLorme does not cure the deficiencies of Arner in view of Applicant's Admissions.

IV. Rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arner in view of applicant's admissions and in further view of Inokuchi (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0080510; hereinafter "Inokuchi"). Claim 13 should be deemed allowable by virtue of its dependency to claim 4 for at least the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Inokuchi does not cure the deficiencies of Arner in view of Applicant's Admissions.

Further, Applicant submits that Inokuchi is not at all concerned with a camping reservation system. There is no teaching or suggestion that camping vehicle attribute information comprises the number of people who will be staying at the camping facility, as claimed. Therefore, assuming Inokuchi were to be combined with Arner, the combination still fails to teach the claimed elements.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruthleen E. Uy/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

Date: September 12, 2007